UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/707,309	11/06/2000	Devendra Kalra	51309	9427

23838 7590 01/13/2006

KENYON & KENYON LLP
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER	
SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2654	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/707,309	KALRA, DEVENDRA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas E. Shortledge	2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 November 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Remarks filed 11/01/2005.

2. Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 18-20, 22, 23 and 28 are amended.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/01/2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rowe et al. (6,073,148).

As to claims 1 and 9, Rowe et al. teach:

creating a document on a computing device (creating a document on a portable device, col. 27, lines 58-67);

initializing the computing device with a portion of font data for a particular language, the portion including less than all of the font data for the particular language (initializing a computing device with shared font data found on the device, fonts needed to display the document that are found on the device are used, col. 28 lines 7-11);

receiving input text in the computing device to initiate the document creation process (downloading an electronic document, col. 27, lines 66-67);

based on the input text, determining whether the portion of the font data is sufficient to create the document on the computing device (determining if the font stored is able to properly display the document, col. 28, lines 8-10);

loading a further portion of the font data to the computing device from a data storage location if the computing device cannot create the document with portion of the font data (if desired font data is not found with the device data store, the font is downloaded, and the effected portions of the text are redrawn with that font data, col. 28, lines 55-60), wherein the further portion of the font data alone or in combination with the portion of the font data are used to create the document (the stored font data and downloaded font data are used to display the document on the device, col. 28, lines 5-10 and 55-60).

As to claims 18, Rowe et al. teach:

creating a document on a computing device (creating a document on a computing device, col. 27, lines 58-67);

receiving input text in the computing device (downloading an electronic document, col. 27, lines 66-67);

based on the input text, determining whether the computing device has a portion of font data for a particular language stored therein to create the document, the potion less than all of the font data for the particular language and if so, creating the document (determining if the font stored is able to properly display the document, where the font

stored on the computing device is not able to fully and correctly create the document based on the stored font, col. 28, lines 8-10);

downloading a further portion of the font data from a data storage location when the computing device does not have the font data stored therein to create the document (if desired font data is not found with the device data store, the font is downloaded, and the effected portions of the text are redrawn with that font data, col. 28, lines 55-60),

creating the document using at least the further portion of the font data, wherein the document allows for the display of the input text (the stored font data and downloaded font data are used to display the document on the device, col. 28, lines 5-10 and 55-60).

As to claim 28, Rowe et al. teach:

creating a document on a computing device (creating a document on a portable device, col. 27, lines 58-67);

receiving input text in the computing device to initiate the document creation process (downloading an electronic document, col. 27, lines 66-67);

based on the input text, determining whether a portion of font data for a particular language, to create the document on the computing device is loaded, wherein displaying the document includes displaying the input text (determining if the font stored is able to properly display the document, col. 28, lines 8-10);

loading a further portion of the font data to the computing device from a data storage location if the computing device cannot create the document with the portion of

the font data (if desired font data is not found with the device data store, the font is downloaded, and the effected portions of the text are redrawn with that font data, col. 28, lines 55-60), wherein the further portion of the font data alone or in combination with the portion of the font data are used to create the document, wherein the document allows for the display of the input text (the stored font data and downloaded font data are used to display the document on the device, col. 28, lines 5-10 and 55-60).

As to claims 2 and 21, Rowe et al teach further discarding undesired data from the computing device after creating the document (font data is stored within downloaded electronic documents, the downloaded font data not being stored within a non-volatile memory, allowing the font data to be discarded once the downloaded electronic data is viewed and discarded, col. 27, line 58 through col. 28, line 11, and col. 28, lines 55-67).

As to claims 3 and 22, Rowe et al. teach further comprising dynamically loading the further portion of the font data during the text inputting step (loading a further portion of font data within a downloaded document, col. 28, lines 55-67).

As to claim 10, Rowe et al. teach displaying the document on a monitor (view an electronic document on a computer device, col. 27, lines 60-67).

As to claim 11, Rowe et al teach further discarding undesired data from the computing device after creating the document (font data is stored within downloaded

electronic documents, the downloaded font data not being stored within a non-volatile memory, allowing the font data to be discarded once the downloaded electronic data is viewed and discarded, col. 27, line 58 through col. 28, line 11, and col. 28, lines 55-67).

As to claim 12, Rowe et al. teach the means for inputting the text comprises one of a keyboard, mouse, pointing device and voice (a computer with a keyboard, col. 5, lines 30-32).

As to claim 17, Rowe et al. teach the computing device comprises one of a personal computer, laptop computer, personal digital assistant, cellular telephone, and a net appliance (a digital computer, col. 5, lines 30-31).

As to claim 19, Rowe et al. teach the downloading the further portion of the font data is performed in a sequential manner (the font data is downloaded after the computer determines if the stored is able to display the document, col. 28, lines 5-12 and 55-60).

As to claim 20, Rowe et al. teach downloading the further portion of the font data is performed in a periodical manner (data is downloaded periodically to the computing device, col. 28, lines 1-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 4-8, 13-16, and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe et al. as applied to claims 1, 9, and 18 above, and further in view of Lakritz (6,623,529).

As to claims 4 and 23, Rowe et al. do not teach inputting text in a first language and loading the further portion of the font data that corresponds to a second language.

However, Lakrtiz teaches a process of localizing documents or web sites by adjusting their language content of the web site or document, (col. 3, lines 27-31). Where it would be necessary that the process of localizing the language content of a document would include a document in a first language and data that translates the document to the second language, where the data would include font data to present the document to the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Rowe et al. with the methods of Lakritz to create a system to localize documents while reducing the overall memory

requirements and enhancing the maintainability of the system as a whole, as taught by Lakritz (col. 2, lines 11-14).

As to claim 5, Rowe et al. teach displaying the document on a monitor (view an electronic document on a computer device, col. 27, lines 60-67).

As to claims 6, 14 and 25, Rowe et al. do not teach the first language comprises a Roman language and the second language comprises a non-Roman language.

However, Lakritz teaches translating the word string from English to Japanese, (col. 8, lines 12-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Rowe et al. with the methods of Lakritz to create a system to localize documents while reducing the overall memory requirements and enhancing the maintainability of the system as a whole, as taught by Lakritz (col. 2, lines 11-14).

As to claims 7, 15 and 26, Rowe et al. do not teach the first language comprises a non-Roman language and the second language comprises a Roman language.

However, Lakritz teaches translating the word string from English to Japanese, (col. 8, lines 12-20), where it would be necessary that a translation can go from English to Japanese, a translation from Japanese to English would also be possible.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Rowe et al. with the methods of Lakritz to create a system to localize documents while reducing the overall memory requirements and enhancing the maintainability of the system as a whole, as taught by Lakritz (col. 2, lines 11-14).

As to claims 8, 16 and 27, Rowe et al. teach the first language comprises English and the second language comprises non-English.

However, Lakritz teaches translating the word string from English to Japanese, (col. 8, lines 12-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Rowe et al. with the methods of Lakritz to create a system to localize documents while reducing the overall memory requirements and enhancing the maintainability of the system as a whole, as taught by Lakritz (col. 2, lines 11-14).

As to claim 13, Rowe et al. do not teach the text is inputted in a first language and the document is created in a second language different from the first.

However, Lakrtiz teaches a process of localizing documents or web sites by adjusting their language content of the web site or document, (col. 3, lines 27-31). Where it would be necessary that the process of localizing the language content of a document would include a document in a first language and data that translates the

document to the second language, where the data would include font data to present the document to the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Rowe et al. with the methods of Lakritz to create a system to localize documents while reducing the overall memory requirements and enhancing the maintainability of the system as a whole, as taught by Lakritz (col. 2, lines 11-14).

As to claim 24, Rowe et al. do not teach displaying the document on the monitor in the second language.

However, Lakritz teach a document localization management and delivery system for computer applications, for viewing localizations of web pages, (col. 3, lines 25-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Rowe et al. with the methods of Lakritz to create a system to localize documents while reducing the overall memory requirements and enhancing the maintainability of the system as a whole, as taught by Lakritz (col. 2, lines 11-14).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is (571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TS
1/5/06

VIJAY CHAWAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER